



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/753,643	01/02/2001	David L. Multer	FUSN1-01005US0	1947

28554 7590 07/30/2003

VIERRA MAGEN MARCUS HARMON & DENIRO LLP
685 MARKET STREET, SUITE 540
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94105

EXAMINER

MOFIZ, APU M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2175

DATE MAILED: 07/30/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/753,643

Applicant(s)

MULTER ET AL.

Examiner

Apu M Mofiz

Art Unit

2175

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 January 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 80-107 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 80-107 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 02 January 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 8.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

2

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 80-107 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Flanagan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,272,545 and Flanagan hereinafter).

As to claim 80, Flanagan teaches a plurality of objects (i.e. Component Object Model based set of synchronization interface components; Synchronization manager communicates with PIM and access object store through synchronization interface component) (Fig.1; Fig.6; col 2, lines 1-5, lines 60-67; col 12, lines 7-32, lines 58-67; col 13, lines 1-67; col 15, lines 53-67), each object translating third party data to a universal middle format (i.e. synchronization does not need to be aware of the particular format of the identifying data segments or of the objects to which they correspond. Rather interface components are called upon for all actions that depend upon the actual content of the identifying data segments, and the content of the objects. It is up to the designer interfaces to define a format (i.e. the universal middle format that it is able to process data in) for the identifying data segments that allows the interfaces to perform their required functions), including a root object providing an entry point (i.e. the

Art Unit: 2175

application interface) into individual application databases (i.e. the application object store) (Fig.1; Fig.6; col 2, lines 1-5, lines 60-67; col 12, lines 7-32, lines 58-67; col 13, lines 1-67; col 15, lines 53-67); at least one child object (Fig.1; Fig.6; col 2, lines 1-5, lines 60-67; col 12, lines 7-32, lines 58-67; col 13, lines 1-67; col 15, lines 53-67); and at least one interface object (i.e. interface component) (Fig.1; Fig.6; col 2, lines 1-5, lines 60-67; col 12, lines 7-32, lines 58-67; col 13, lines 1-67; col 15, lines 53-67).

As to claim 81, Flanagan teaches that the at least one interface object is a component object model interface (Fig.1; Fig.6; col 2, lines 1-5, lines 60-67; col 12, lines 7-32, lines 58-67; col 13, lines 1-67; col 15, lines 53-67).

As to claims 82-97, the limitations of these claims are a standard implementation design of a component object model based synchronization system (Fig.1; Fig.6; col 2, lines 1-5, lines 60-67; col 12, lines 7-32, lines 58-67; col 13, lines 1-67; col 15, lines 53-67).

As to claim 98 and 99, Flanagan teaches an application data function call interpreter, the interpreter being accessible to a synchronization engine and an application running on a network coupled device having user data (i.e. the user devices with local databases are connected through a network with the synchronization engine) (Fig.1; Fig.6; col 2, lines 1-5, lines 60-67; col 12, lines 7-32, lines 58-67; col 13, lines 1-67; col 15, lines 53-67); and a universal data record mapping formatter (i.e.

synchronization does not need to be aware of the particular format of the identifying data segments or of the objects to which they correspond. Rather interface components are called upon for all actions that depend upon the actual content of the identifying data segments, and the content of the objects. It is up to the designer interfaces to define a format (i.e. the universal middle format that it is able to process data in) for the identifying data segments that allows the interfaces to perform their required functions) (Fig.1; Fig.6; col 2, lines 1-5, lines 60-67; col 12, lines 7-32, lines 58-67; col 13, lines 1-67; col 15, lines 53-67).

As to claims 100-107, the limitations of these claims are standard features of an object based synchronization engine (i.e. the methods open, close, add, delete, get_next_record, get_modified_record and the api (i.e. Application Program interfaces) to receive individual application database data must be integral part of a synchronization engine) (Fig.1; Fig.6; col 2, lines 1-5, lines 60-67; col 12, lines 7-32, lines 58-67; col 13, lines 1-67; col 15, lines 53-67).

Points of Contact

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Apu M. Mofiz whose telephone number is (703) 605-4240. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Thursday 8:00 A.M. to 4:30 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici can be reached at (703) 3053830. The fax numbers for the group is (703) 746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

Charles Rones
CHARLES RONES
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Apu M. Mofiz
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2175

July 25,2003